| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/669,770 | 09/23/2003 | Teodoro Cipresso | SVL920020058US1 | 4364 |

24033          7590          08/06/2008
KONRAD RAYNES & VICTOR, LLP
315 S. BEVERLY DRIVE
# 210
BEVERLY HILLS, CA 90212

| EXAMINER |
|---|
| STORK, KYLE R |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2178 | |

| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|---|---|
| 08/06/2008 | PAPER |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>24 January 2007</u>.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.         2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-18</u> is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-18</u> is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**
1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____.

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
PTOL-326 (Rev. 08-06)                Office Action Summary                Part of Paper No./Mail Date 20080804

## DETAILED ACTION

1.      This non-final office action is in response to the amendment filed 24 January

2007.

2.      Claims 1-18 are pending.  Claims 1, 7, and 13 are independent claims.


### *Claim Objections*

3.      Claims 1 and 5 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 1 references "the covertor" in line 10.  Further, claim 5 references "the

converter (lines 3-4). However, it appears as though the claim intends to reference

"convertors (line 6)."  For the purpose of examination, the examiner will treat " covetor"

and "converters" as if it read "convertor".    However, appropriate correction is required

to unify the use of "covertor," "convertor," and "converter".


### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101*

4.      35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of
> matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the
> conditions and requirements of this title.

5.      Claims 13-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is

directed to non-statutory subject matter.

As per independent claim 13, the applicant claims a computer system for

converting a text representation of a number into a numeric representation of a number

(lines 1-2).  However, the applicant's computer system appears to be a plurality of

software components (lines 3-11).  This system does not fall within a statutory category

of invention as it is neither a machine, manufacture, composition of matter, nor a

process.  Therefore, claim 13 is non-statutory.

Claims 14-18 fail to cure the deficiencies of claim 13.  Therefore, claims 14-18

are similarly rejected.


### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6.      The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7.      Claims 1, 4, 6-7, 10, 12-13, 16, and 18 remain rejected and claims 5, 11, and 17

are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Davis et al. (US 5657259,

patented 12 August 1997, hereafter Davis).

As per independent claim 1, Davis discloses an article of manufacture for use in

a computer system for converting a text representation of a number into a numeric

representation of the number, said article of manufacture comprising a computer-usable

storage medium having a computer program embodied in said medium which causes a

computer system to execute the computer program to perform the operations, the

operations comprising:

maintaining a correspondence of number format descriptions to converters

(column 8, line 55- column 9, line 6: Here, the number format is defined.  This allows the

conversion of the specified number format to binary)

converting the text representation of the number into a description of the

number's format (column 7, lines 18-47 and column 8, lines 31-51: Here, it is

determined if the text of the number can be normalized for conversion from text to a

binary number, and from a binary number back into a text string.  The descriptor is

either the Boolean value true or the Boolean value false.  Further, the TNumerals value

is set based upon the TNumberFormat.  The TNumberFormat determines the

characters used within the text string and the corresponding number values)

mapping the description of the number's format to the converter corresponding to

the description of the number's format, wherein the converter comprises a sequence of

conversion code (column 8, lines 16-51: Here, based upon the number format, the

appropriate mapping is performed to map the text character to its associated numerical

value.  For example, if TUnicode::kRoman, then the character L is mapped to the

numerical value of 50)

executing the converter corresponding to the description of the number's format

to convert the text representation of the number into the numeric representation of the

number by use of the sequence of conversion code (column 8, lines 16-51)

As per dependent claim 4, Davis discloses wherein the sequence of conversion

code for converting the text representation of the number into the numeric

representation of the number comprises an assignment statement (column 9, lines

4062; column 10, lines 7-22; column 15, lines 41-52: Here, text elements are mapped

and converted into a number).

As per dependent claim 5, Davis discloses wherein the mapping of the description of the number's format to the converter comprises mapping the description of the number's format to an index which is used to transfer control to the converter corresponding to the description of the number's format (column 7, lines 18-47 and column 8, line 16-51: Here, based upon the mapping, the appropriate converter is identified. For example, if Roman Numerals are used, the TUnicode variable is set to kRoman instead of the default value of kArabic. Based upon the setting of the TUnicode value, the text is converted to numeric values)

As per dependent claim 6, Davis discloses wherein, if the text representation of the number does not convert into the description of the numbers format, then not executing the subsequent mapping and converting steps (column 5, lines 48-55).

As per 7, 10-13, 16-18, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claims 1, 4, and 6 respectively. Claims 7, 10, 12-13, 16, and 18 are similarly rejected.

## *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

8.      The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9.      Claims 2, 8, and 14 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Davis, and further in view of Turpin et al. (US 5608898, patented 4

March 1997, hereafter Turpin).

As per dependent claim 2, Davis discloses the limitations similar to those in claim

1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein.  Davis fails to specifically disclose

wherein the number's format is a picture string.  However, Turpin discloses use of a

picture string as a number format (column 10, lines 11-16).  It would have been obvious

to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have

combined Turpin with Davis, since it would have allowed a user to convert from text

data to a picture string.

As per claims 8 and 14, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially

similar to those in claim 2.  Claims 8 and 14 are similarly rejected.


10.     Claims 3, 9, and 15 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Davis, and further in view of Omori (US 2004/0086861, filed 16

October 2002).

As per dependent claim 3, Davis discloses the limitations similar  to those in

claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein.  Davis further discloses wherein

the number is converted into a description of the number's format by a translation

instruction (column 8, lines 16-51).  However, Davis fails to specifically disclose wherein

the translation uses a translation table.  However, Omori discloses use of a translation

table for translations (paragraph 0166).  It would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Omori with

Davis, since it would have allowed for more efficient translation by looking up the

appropriate translation in a translation table.

As per claims 9 and 15, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially

similar to those in claim 3.  Claims 9 and 15 are similarly rejected.


### *Response to Arguments*

11.    Applicant's arguments filed 11 November 2006 have been fully considered but

they are not persuasive.

The applicant's initial argument as based upon the belief that Davis fails to

disclose mapping the description of the number's format to the converter corresponding

to the description of the number's format, wherein the converter comprises a sequence

of conversion code (page 8).  However, the examiner respectfully disagrees.  Davis

discloses mapping the description of the number's format to the converter

corresponding to the description of the number's format, wherein the converter

comprises a sequence of conversion code (column 8, lines 16-51: Here, based upon the

number format, the appropriate mapping is performed to map the text character to its

associated numerical value.  For example, if TUnicode::kRoman, then the character L is

mapped to the numerical value of 50).

The applicant further argues that Davis fails to disclose executing the converter

corresponding to the description of the number's format to convert the text

representation of the number into the numeric representation of the number by use of

the sequence of conversion code (page 9). However, the examiner respectfully

disagrees. Davis discloses executing the converter corresponding to the description of

the number's format to convert the text representation of the number into the numeric

representation of the number by use of the sequence of conversion code (column 8,

lines 16-51).

The applicant further argues that the prior art fails to disclose use of an

assignment statement (page 9). Again, the examiner respectfully disagrees. Davis

discloses assigning the TUnicode value to the appropriate character set for conversion

from text to numeric values (column 8, lines 16-51).

The applicant's remaining arguments appear to be variations of the arguments

above.  These arguments are similarly not persuasive.


## Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to KYLE R. STORK whose telephone number is (571)272-

4130.  The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124.  The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kyle R Stork/

Kyle R Stork
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2178


krs